

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1459 Atomorbia, Opinia 22313-1450 www.uaplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/007,697	12/10/2001	Jacques Berlemont	P67396US0 9897		
7	7590 01/02/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
JACOBSON HOLMAN			YOON, TAE H		
	H STREET, N.W. DN, DC 20004		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGIC	714, DC 20001		1714		

DATE MAILED: 01/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					61.2		
		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/007,6	97	BERLEMONT ET A	L.		
	Office Action Summary	Examine	•	Art Unit			
		Tae H Yo	on	1714			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commu or Reply	nication appears on the	e cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNISIONS of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this conperiod for reply sepecified above is less than thirty period for reply is specified above, the maximum to to reply within the set or extended period for repepty received by the Office later than three months dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NICATION. as of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no eventualization. (30) days, a reply within the statstatutory period will apply and welly will, by statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be tim utory minimum of thirty (30) days ill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from I lication to become ABANDONE!	ely filed s will be considered timely, the mailing date of this com O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ımunication.		
1)[	Responsive to communication(s) fi	led on					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL.	2b)⊠ This action is no	on-final.				
3)[	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restr	are withdrawn from co					
•	on Papers		- 4				
9)	The specification is objected to by t	he Examiner.					
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are		Objected to by the E	Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
_	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	-					
·	The oath or declaration is objected	to by the Examiner. No	ote the attached Office	Action or form PTC	)-152.		
	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) □ All b) □ Some * c) □ None of:  1. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. □ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  13) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.  37 CFR 1.78.  a) □ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.  14) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.							
Attachmen			_				
2) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)		4) Interview Summary 5) Notice of Informal Page 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 1714

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recited "the cured polymer" in line 3 of claim 1 lacks an antecedent basis.

With respect to claim 9, it is unclear what additional species are allowed into the genus of the terminology modified by "types". The word "type" therefore makes the modified terminology indefinite. See Ex parte Copenhaver, POBA, 1955, 109 USPQ 118-119. The recited "derivatives" is also indefinite. Improper Markush language is recited and a proper format is "--selected from the group consisting of A, B, C--- and Z". The recited "—the base polymer is selected from polymers or their derivatives of the rubber, styrene-butadiene rubber ----- elastomer or themoplastic synthetic high polymer types" is confusing since it contains genera and species, and a separate claim having a narrow scope is suggested. The recited "the rubber" in line 3 lacks an antecedent basis.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

<sup>(</sup>b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1714

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 59024627.

JP teaches multi-colored granules comprising a binder and coloring materials in abstract. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Schonfeld et al (US 6,017,984).

Schonfeld et al teach polymeric pellets having the instant shade in abstract and examples. Coated substrates are also taught at col. 9, lines 8-20. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Weaver et al (US 5,962,557).

Weaver et al teach polymeric pellets having the instant shade and their use at col. 1, lines 11-21, col. 6, line 58 to col. 7, line 8 and in examples 1-3. Thus, the instant invention lacks novelty.

Art Unit: 1714

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 11-13 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 19-25 of copending Application No. 10/278,013. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant coating and molded articles encompasses those of said application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1714

Page 5

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Tae H Yoon Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

THY/December 18, 2003